

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action claims 118 and 120 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the term "small" is considered a relative term and therefore vague and indefinite. Claim 118 has been amended to define the small diameter tube as having a diameter of about 1/16 to about 5/16 of an inch. This amendment for claim 118 places a size range on the term "small" and this term is no longer vague and indefinite. Claims 119 and 120 are dependent upon claim 118 and it is submitted that the amendment to claim 118 obviates a rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, with respect to these dependent claims. The support for the amendment to claim 118 can be found on page 40, line 20 of the Specification. In view of the amendment to claim 118 it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC § 112 for the claims.

Claims 118 and 119 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Johnson reference in view of the LoPresti et al. reference.

The Applicant's amended claims define a method for applying a fluid to an object wherein a small diameter tube extends from a container for holding the fluid to the application surface of an applicator tip whereby the fluid from the container is supplied directly to the applicator surface. A pump that engages the exterior surface of the small diameter tube is used to pump the fluid from the container to the applicator surface. The fluid only contacts the container, the small diameter tube, the applicator surface of the applicator tip and the object. The pump engages and constricts the small diameter tube when the fluid is not being pumped whereby the pump has to restrict the flow of fluid in the small diameter tube.

The Johnson reference discloses an apparatus for the automated application of coatings to a substrate. The coating is delivered from a reservoir through a pump and through an applicator device. A tube extends from the reservoir through the pump into the applicator. However, the tube does not extend

into the reservoir for the fluid and there is no disclosure or suggestion that the tube can be removed from the reservoir as set forth in Applicant's claims. In addition, the tube is not in contact with the application surface of the applicator tip whereby fluid is supplied from the container directly to the applicator surface as defined in Applicant's claims. In the Johnson reference the tube is attached to the end of the applicator that is spaced apart from the application surface and the tube is not in contact with the application surface of the applicator tip. Accordingly, the Johnson reference does not disclose or suggest the invention defined by Applicant's amended claims.

The LoPresti et al. reference is directed to a disposable paint container liner that is used with a paint spray gun. The LoPresti reference is cited by the Examiner as showing a small diameter tube that extends into a container. The LoPresti reference does show a tube 38 that extends into a container but the tube is connected to an opening 37 in the lid for the paint cup. The tube does not extend from the container to the application surface of an applicator tip as set forth in Applicant's amended claims. In addition, the LoPresti reference does not disclose a small diameter tube whereby the fluid only contacts the container, the small diameter tube, the applicator surface and the object as defined in the Applicant's amended claims. Therefore, the LoPresti et al. reference does not provide the deficiencies of the previously discussed Johnson reference. The Johnson and LoPresti references, taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention defined by Applicant's amended claims. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this basis of rejection for the claims.

Claim 120 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Johnson reference in view of the LoPresti et al. reference and further in view of the Figini et al. reference.

The teachings of the Johnson and LoPresti et al. reference have already been discussed in this Amendment.

Appl. No. 10/658,706
Amdt. Dated January 18, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 27, 2006

The Figini et al. reference discloses a process for dispensing a sealing or adhesive product. The Figini et al. reference discloses the use of a peristaltic pump to move the adhesive product through the applicator device. However, the Figini et al. reference does not disclose or suggest a small diameter tube that extends from a container to the application surface of an applicator tip whereby the fluid is supplied from the container through the small diameter tube directly to the applicator surface as defined in Applicant's amended claims. Accordingly, the Figini et al. reference fails to provide the deficiencies of the previously discussed Johnson and LoPresti et al. references. The Johnson, LoPresti et al. and Figini et al. references, taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention defined by Applicant's amended claims. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this basis of rejection for the claims.

In view of the amendment to the claims and the comments presented herein it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims patentably distinguish over the prior art relied upon by the Examiner. Accordingly, a favorable action on the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
EMCH, SCHAFFER, SCHAUB
& PORCELLO CO., L.P.A.

By: Charles R. Schaub
Charles R. Schaub
Reg. No. 27,518
Tel.: (419) 243-1294